

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3 and 20-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1 008 310 A1 ("EP '310") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,200,195 to Furuno ("Furuno").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-13, 16, 17, and 20-47 are pending for consideration. Claims 4-13, 16, and 17 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 1 has been amended.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the interview of October 16, 2007.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 and 20-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '310 in view of Furuno. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the claims as amended.

Claim 1 recites that "the barrier layer prevents absorption of the adhesive silicone gel coating into the fabric substrate." Applicants respectfully assert that this requirement is not met by the hot-melt film layer of EP '310 as maintained in the Office Action.

The Office Action asserts that "[s]ince the hot-melt film layer functions as a tie layer, and nowhere is there a disclosure that the adhesive layer penetrate into the cloth (fabric) layer, EP '310 teaches the barrier layer as claimed." Applicants disagree with this position for at least two reasons. First, no barrier layer is present or is necessary in EP '310 because the adhesive is cured before the layer sheet (consisting of the film layer and adhesive layer) is applied to the clothing.

(paragraphs [0039]-[0042].) Therefore, because the adhesive is cured before application to the clothing, the barrier layer as recited in claim 1 is not disclosed or required by EP '310.

Second, EP '310 explains that the layer sheet is provided with vent holes which cover 5% to 85% of the surface area of the layer sheet. If the adhesive layer were not cured when the layer sheet was applied to the clothing of EP '310 – or if the adhesive layer were applied to the film layer after the film layer was attached to the clothing – the film layer would not prevent absorption of the adhesive into the clothing because of all the vent holes. For at least these reasons, the barrier layer recited in claim 1 is patentably distinguished from the film layer of EP '310.

Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the barrier layer is impervious. Although this modification is redundant in that the barrier layer is already required to prevent absorption of the adhesive silicone gel coating, we add the term to reinforce the distinctions between the recited claims and EP '310.

In addition, Furuno includes no disclosure or suggestion that would overcome the deficiencies in the disclosure of EP '310.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-3 and 20-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP '310 in view of Furuno be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: January 8, 2008

By:



Kent Basson

Registration No. 48,125

CUSTOMER NO. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

202.739.3000